

REMARKS

Examiner's comments in the Office Action marked "non-final" and dated June 12, 2008 have been read and carefully considered by Applicant. In view of such comments, Applicant has amended the set of claims in the Application as set forth hereinabove. In particular, Applicant has canceled claims 1, 2, 7-13, and 20; amended claims 3, 6, and 14; left claim 15 in its original form; and added new claims 21-23. Claims 4, 5, and 16-19 remain withdrawn from Examiner's consideration. In so amending the set of claims, however, Applicant maintains that no new matter has been impermissibly introduced into the Application as originally filed. In view of such, claims 3, 6, 14, 15, and 21-23 thus remain pending in Applicant's present Application for Examiner's consideration.

At the present time, it is Applicant's good faith belief that the pending claims, as presented herein, are both novel and non-obvious in view of all known prior art and that the claims properly comply with all applicable statutory requirements. Therefore, Applicant respectfully avers that the pending claims now place the present Application in a condition for allowance and notice thereof is respectfully requested.

Objections to the Drawings for Informalities:

In the Office Action, Examiner objected to the drawings for various informalities.

In response, Applicant has amended the set of drawing figures in the Application. (See REPLACEMENT SHEETS for amended Figures 1A-12 submitted herewith.)

In general, the amended Figures 1A-12 herewith submitted by Applicant are merely more formal (i.e., professionally prepared) versions of the drawing figures that were originally filed by Applicant. In amended Figure 4, however, feature reference designation "96" has been newly added. Also, in Figure 8B, feature reference designation "116B" has been newly added as well. Proper support for adding feature reference designation "96" into Figure 4 can be found in specification paragraph 0048 of the Application, and support for adding the designation "116B" in Figure 8B can be found in specification paragraph 0059.

In addition to amending the drawing figures, Applicant has also amended original paragraphs 0043-0047, 0059, and 0065 of the written specification in the Application. (See amended paragraphs of the specification as set forth hereinabove.) In doing so, Applicant has merely removed alphanumeric feature reference designations from the original specification that were not specifically included in the original drawing figures. Such feature reference designations herein removed from the written specification specifically include "25L," "50R," "52R," "54R," "57R," "64R," "74R," "94R," "112L," "118L," "136L," "137L," "164L," "166L," "168L," and "170R."

With regard to other alphanumeric feature reference designations specifically mentioned by Examiner in the Office Action, Applicant respectfully maintains that all such other feature reference designations are now properly set forth somewhere both in the drawing figures and in the written specification of the Application per professionally accepted patent-drafting convention(s).

In view of amending the drawing figures and also the written specification as described above, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner's objections to the drawings figures be withdrawn.

Objections to the Drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a):

In the Office Action, Examiner objected to the drawing figures under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) as failing to show every feature of Applicant's invention that is specified in claims 2, 9, 11, 13, and 20.

In response, Applicant has herein canceled claims 2, 9, 11, 13, and 20.

In view of canceling claims 2, 9, 11, 13, and 20 as such, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner's objections to the drawing figures under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) be withdrawn.

Objections to the Specification under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(d)(1):

In the Office Action, Examiner objected to the written specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis and support for subject matter that is set forth in claims 9, 11, 13, and 20. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(d)(1) and also M.P.E.P. § 608.01(o).

In response, Applicant has herein canceled claims 9, 11, 13, and 20.

In view of canceling claims 9, 11, 13, and 20 as such, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner's objections to the written specification be withdrawn.

Provisional Rejection of Claims for Double Patenting:

In the Office Action, Examiner provisionally rejected claims 1, 7, and 20 as being unpatentable over claim 1 in co-pending Application Number 11/383,528 or claims 7 and 20 in co-pending Application Number 11/383,580 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting.

In response, Applicant has herein canceled claims 1, 7, and 20.

In view of canceling claims 1, 7, and 20 as such, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner's provisional claim rejections under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1:

In the Office Action, Examiner rejected claims 7-13 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1 as containing subject matter that is not sufficiently enabled by the specification of the Application.

In response, Applicant has herein canceled claims 7-13 and 20.

In view of canceling claims 7-13 and 20 as such, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner's claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2:

In the Office Action, Examiner rejected dependent claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter that Applicant regards as his invention.

In response, Applicant has herein canceled claim 2.

In view of canceling claim 2 as such, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner's claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b):

In the Office Action, Examiner rejected independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated, and therefore rendered unpatentable, by United States Patent Number 5,346,233, which was issued to Donald W. Moser on September 13, 1994 (hereinafter "Moser").

In response, Applicant has herein canceled claim 1.

In view of canceling claim 1 as such, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner's claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

In the Office Action, Examiner rejected dependent claims 2, 3, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being rendered obvious, and therefore unpatentable, by United States Patent Number 6,065,556, which was issued to William Andrews on May 23, 2000 ("Andrews"), in view of the aforementioned Moser reference.

In response, Applicant has herein canceled claim 2 and also amended claims 3 and 6 so that claims 3 and 6 are now dependent on claim 14, which Examiner has indicated contains allowable (i.e., patentable) subject matter. (See claims 3 and 6 as amended hereinabove.)

In view of amending claims 2, 3, and 6 as such, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner's claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter:

In the Office Action, Examiner objected to dependent claims 14 and 15 but indicated that the general subject matter set forth in these claims is patentable and that the claims would thus be allowable if claim 14 were rewritten in independent form so as to include all limitations of each claim upon which claim 14 is dependent.

In response, Applicant has herein rewritten claim 14 in independent form as suggested by Examiner. In view of such, and since claim 15 is dependent on claim 14, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner's objections to claims 14 and 15 be withdrawn.

Subject Matter Support for New Claims:

Also, in the present Amendment, Applicant has added new claims 21-23 to the Application. (See new claims 21-23 in the amended set of claims as set forth hereinabove.) In general, proper subject matter support from the Application as originally filed for each of new claims 21-23 is cited hereinbelow.

For support of new dependent claim 21, see specification paragraph 0049 and also Figure 4 of the Application as originally filed by Applicant.

For support of new dependent claim 22, see specification paragraph 0051 and also Figure 4 of the Application as originally filed by Applicant.

For support of new dependent claim 23, see specification paragraph 0052 and also Figure 4 of the Application as originally filed by Applicant.

In view of the above, Applicant maintains that no new matter has been impermissibly introduced into the Application by so adding new claims 21-23. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that new claims 21-23 be received and entered by Examiner for consideration.

CONCLUSION

In view of the set of claims as amended and also the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3, 6, 14, 15, and 21-23 properly comply with all statutory requirements for patentability. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner's objections and rejections in the Office Action be withdrawn and that a Notice of Allowance be issued for all claims 3, 6, 14, 15, and 21-23.

Also, together with this Amendment, a "Petition for an Extension of Time" (2 months) along with appropriate fee is being submitted. Receipt and entry thereof by Examiner is respectfully requested by Applicant.

Furthermore, should payment of any additional fees be necessary for herein adding new claims 21-23 to the Application, Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any such additional fees to Deposit Account Number 04-1061.

Lastly, should Examiner have any questions with respect to any matter now of record, Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at (248) 433-7200.

Respectfully submitted,

DICKINSON WRIGHT PLLC



John S. Artz, Reg. No. 36,431
38525 Woodward Avenue, Suite 2000
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48304-5092
telephone: (248) 433-7200
facsimile: (248) 433-7274

Dated: November 12, 2008